MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS HELD DECEMBER 3 AND 4, 1915.

223

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1916 was held in their office at 1729 New York Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C., on Friday and Saturday December 3 and 4, 1915. The following members were present:

Charles Moore, Chairman;

Frederick Law Olmsted:

Thomas Hastings;

Peirce Anderson:

Edwin H. Blashfield;

Herbert Adams:

also Colonel William W. Harts, United States Army, the Secretary and Executive officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9.30 A.M. Friday morning and proceeded at once to the business before it.

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: The minutes of the preceding meeting, held October 2 and 3, 1915, were presented by the Secretary and approved.

2. APPROVAL OF THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1915: The Commission approved the text of the annual report for the last fiscal year for transmission to the President in accordance with the draft submitted by the Secretary to each member.

In this connection the Chairman read a draft of a letter which he believed should accompany the formal transmission of the report. The Commission agreed that this was desirable and the letter was turned over to Mr. Olmsted, who, in conjunction with Mr. Moore, was to put it in final shape. (See Exhibit A).

1. STUDIES FOR APPROACH AND IMMEDIATE VICINITY OF THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL: The Commission studied various sketches prepared by Mr. Clarence Howard and a study prepared by Mr. Henry Bacon for the treatment of the eastern approach to the Lincoln Memorial, and of its immediate environs. Mr. Howard is studying these questions under

direct authorization of Colonel Harts, Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds under directions of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and Mr. Bacon's study was prepared on his own initiative. Considerable discussion ensued. The following points were definitely decided upon:

(a) That the Commission had studied the various sketches made and has selected the circular treatment.

(b) That the widening of the north and south street (23rd Street) is a good thing.

(c) That a narrower avenue in the circle, a road of approximately 60 feet in width, is preferable. A 27' grade was established for this roadway.

(d) That seven rows of trees around the outer edge of the circle as shown on one of the plans (B) submitted by Mr. Howard is too wide, possibly five rows being better; and that the circling path in the area of this planting is to be preferred to another encircling road.

(e) Openings in the massing of these trees as shown on Mr. Howard's plan are a desirable feature.

Mr. Bacon agreed, with the documents that had been under consideration, to make a study and freely take up what has been suggested during the discussion and then present at the next meeting a plan for the immediate surroundings of the memorial. Mr. Howard will then take this plan, if it is satisfactory and approved, and incorporate it in a skilled general plan of the surrounding area lying between the Washington Monument and the river, and north and south B Streets, showing the relation of the memorial to the other portions of the park. Mr. Howard was requested to confer with the architect-members of the Commission for his further guidance.

2. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER: Colonel Harts, on behalf of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission, submitted blueprints showing a general plan of approaches, the developed elevation of the terrace wall at the main approach, and details of the balustrades and retaining wall at the west entrance to the Arlington

Memorial Amphitheater, which were prepared by Messrs. Carrere and Hastings, architects, of New York City. Mr. Hastings explained details of the plans on behalf of his firm. The plans were approved. (Plans in Commission of Fine Arts File No.100A)

3. NEW SITE FOR STATE DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Assistant Secretary of State William Phillips, in a letter addressed to the Chairman, inquired for his own information whether the Commission of Fine Arts favors the site on the Mall which has already been selected for the proposed new State Department building, or whether in their opinion a better site would be in that block immediately east of the Lafayette Square and north of the State, War and Navy building, known as square 167 of the Assessor's plat book. The Commission in their reply informed Mr. Phillips that they favored the latter site and not the site selected on the Mall. (See Exhibits B and C).

4. NEW DESIGNS FOR HALF-DOLLAR, QUARTER DOLLAR AND ONE-DIME PIECES: Twenty-five years having nearly elapsed since the adoption of the present designs of half-dollar, quarter-dollar and one-dime pieces, under the law coins with new designs will have to be issued. Under instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Mint Mr. R. W. Woolley, appeared before the Commission by appointment at 11 o'clock for conference regarding these designs. Mr. Woolley stated that before going to an outside designer the Mint had their designer, Mr. Barber, prepare a number of preliminary designs, which he had brought with him, and laid before the Commission. The Director stated that although the same design has been heretofore used for all three of the old coins, it was the intention to use distinctive designs for each of the new coins. Mr. Barber was present in consultation. Considerable discussion ensued. Mr. Woolley, after leaving the meeting, returned at one o'clock the following day and lunched with the Commission. During the luncheon the details of the problem were again discussed with him. Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield were appointed a Committee to prepare the reply to be made the Director of the Mint. This reply, containing the conclusions of the Committee, is attached hereto under Exhibit D.

5. COMPLETION OF CAPITOL FRIEZE: The Commission next took under consideration the request of the Joint Committee on the Library dated December 2, 1914, for a report upon S. J. Res., 63d Congress, 2d Session, providing for the completion of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol. This matter had been under consideration at various meetings since its reference by that Committee, but had been held in abeyance until the Commission had been given an opportunity to consult Mr. Elliot Woods, Superintendent of the Capitol, in the matter. Mr. Hastings, Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield were appointed a Committee to inspect the frieze with Mr. Woods. This inspection took place at 9.30 a.m., December 4th. The conclusion reached was that under present conditions it is inadvisable to attempt either alteration or continuation of the frieze as it now stands (Exhibit E.)

6. MONTROSE PARK: Based on criticisms made by Mr. Olmsted on plans for the treatment of Montrose Park submitted by the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds at the last meeting, Colonel Harts presented a sketch which sought to recognize the suggestions made at that time. After visiting the park with the other members of the Commission later in the day Mr. Olmsted indicated on the sketch (P.B.&.G.File 324.28) a number of suggestions for further desirable minor changes.

7. PLAN FOR ROCK CREEK PARKWAY: Colonel Harts next presented a series of plans prepared under his direction in the office of Public Buildings and Grounds, in his capacity as Executive and Disbursing Officer of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission, for the acquisition of additional lands for Rock Creek Park and the connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park and Potomac Park. The Commission inspected these studies and were very much pleased with them. They were approved as preliminary studies for presentation to Congress, the understanding being that they are in shape to be submitted to Congress with the approval of the Commission indicated. Colonel Harts was highly complimented on the efficient and painstaking manner with which this important project had been handled and in particular on the diplomatic and effective way his incidental negotiations with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company and the Washington

Gas Light Company had been undertaken.

8. EAST POTOMAC PARK RECREATION FIELD: Colonel Harts also presented a study prepared in the office of Public Buildings and Grounds under his direction for the development of the large area lying east of the railroad embankment and Potomac Park, commonly called East Potomac Park, as a public recreation ground. The Commission inspected the plan and upon motion approved it as a satisfactory preliminary plan for presentation of the project to Congress (P.B.&.G.File No.333-19)

9. BOTANIC GARDEN: In connection with the approval of the project for developing East Potomac Park into a large public recreation field, Colonel Harts called attention to the action taken by the Commission on January 23, 1914, on the following resolution of the Joint Committee on the Library which had been under consideration at that time:

> "RESOLVED. That the Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds be requested to report to the Committee at its next meeting a plan for the termination of the use of the ground now occupied by the Botanic Garden, as such, with reference to the unveiling of the Grant Memorial erected on these grounds, but before making such report said officer should consult with the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the subject."

He stated that the minutes of that meeting showed that the office of Public Buildings and Grounds at the same time had requested advice regarding the removal of the United States Propagating Gardens, now situated immediately south of the Washington Monument and west of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and that the Commission at that time had advised that the Botanic Garden be temporarily consolidated with the Propagating Gardens and that plans be prepared for the removal of both of them to East Potomac Park.

In view of the development of the recreation project for East Potomac Park the Commission now felt that some supplementary action was necessary. The sense of the discussion can best be indicated by the following extract from a draft of a letter prepared for Colonel Harts' use (Exhibit E, attached) for transmission to Senator Lea and Mr. Slayden, Chairmen of the Committee on the Library of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, supplementing the report made by him on February

9, 1914, in response to the resolution quoted above:

"Various sites in the District of Columbia offer opportunities and special advantages. No one of these available sites has such a superiority over the others as to make it conspicuously the best. Nor can it be determined which choice would commend itself to Congress. Therefore it is suggested that the Joint Committee on the Library, under whose jurisdiction the Botanic Garden is maintained, investigate the subject of such relocation. It is further suggested that the Officer in Charge of Buildings and Grounds, the Superintendent of the Botanic Gardens, with the addition of such experts as the Committee may name, be authorized to study the subject and report to the Committee their findings."

10. SEVENTEENTH STREET PLANTING PLAN: Colonel Harts submitted a final study for the planting treatment of the area immediately south of the State, War and Navy Departments building and extending as far as B street, north. Mr. Olmsted was appointed a Committee of one with power to confer with Colonel Harts. After an inspection of the ground later in the day with the other members of the Commission, Mr. Olmsted again visited the site with Colonel Harts the following day and explained to him the planting arrangement deemed most desirable there. The most important of the changes suggested by Mr. Olmsted were indicated by him in pencil on the plan submitted (P.B.&.G.File 1.23) The treatment of the lower half of the area, that is the portion nearest B street, was not considered satisfactory, however.

Luncheon was then partaken of in the office, in which Mr. Bacon and Mr. Jules Guerin joined. After luncheon the Commission proceeded to the Lincoln Memorial site, accompanied by Mr. Bacon, Mr. Guerin, and Mr. Howard, where they thoroughly viewed the situation. After this inspection they proceeded along Rock Creek to Montrose Park where they studied the matter of the proposed treatment of that park. The Commission then adjourned till 9.30 the following morning.

SECOND DAY'S MEETING.

The meeting convened again at 9.30 Saturday morning.

11. ANACOSTIA FLATS: Colonel C. A. F. Flagler, in charge of the Local United States Engineer Office, and Major Kutz, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, comprising, with Colonel Harts, the Board on the Anacostia River development, conferred with Mr. Olmsted (who at the last meeting had been appointed a Committee

of one with power to represent the Commission in this matter) and the Chairman regarding certain proposed changes in the plans for the Anacostia Park. These changes had been discussed with Mr. Olmsted at the last meeting when he accompanied the members of the Board on a personal inspection of portions of the areas to be developed, and the latest plan submitted and under discussion by the Board recognized the conclusions reached in conference with him at that meeting. An encircling driveway proposed by the District Commissioners, to be located on the outskirts of the reclaimed park areas, was also indicated on the map under consideration. In general the lines of this preliminary study were satisfactory, and no objection to the lines of the proposed encircling roadway as shown on the plat was anticipated on grounds that it would interfere with the development of the park areas. The results of the conference as far as changes in the lines on the plan were concerned were indicated for the information of the Board by Mr. Olmsted in pencil on the plat under discussion. The following more important decisions made were noted:

(a) The channel along the southern shore was approved as shown.

(b) The establishment of an approximately fixed level water park on the north shore was approved.

(c) The lines of the banks of the fixed line portions may be changed to accommodate whatever necessities may arise in the future, but with minor modifications, the lines of the channel are approximately correct.

(d) Bridges, locks and other structures can be made of reinforced concrete of simple architectural lines with the surface tooled or brushed to show aggregate.

The Commission had previously approved a plan for the development of this area, submitted by the United States Engineer Office, in which a dam, to be located on the line of Massachusetts avenue, was a distinctive feature. Upon further careful study of the conditions of the channel, however, the Engineer Office ascertained that the silt and other material which it was supposed settled in the area by tidal deposit in reality came from upstream. This necessitated elimination of the dam and realignment of some of the channel and park lines. The changes thus made necessary were embodied in the plan under discussion.

12. PLANS FOR NEW FISH MARKET, D. C.: The District Commissioners transmitted for the consideration of the Commission a plan and elevation of the new fish market proposed for location on the water front between Tenth and Twelfth streets, S.W., for which an appropriation of $125,000 has been made. The limit of cost of the project is $185,000. In reviewing the design the Commission felt that the Flemish treatment of the gable shown struck a discordant note, and, therefore, disapproved of the design. In accordance with previous recommendations in favor of a uniform style of architecture for public buildings, the Commission recommended the preparation of a design in sympathy with the Classic or derived Colonial motives, and its resubmission to the Commission. (See Exhibit F)

13. DESIGN FOR A.B.C.MEDIATOR MEDALS SUBMITTED TO STATE DEPARTMENT BY MISS SCUDDER: During the morning the Department of State sent over a large-scale plaster-study showing in the rough a design executed by Miss Janet Scudder for the A.B.C. mediator medals, for the execution of which she has been selected by that Department. The Commission felt that the design was presented in such scanty form that it was not possible to give any opinion except to express approval of the conception of the idea. Mr. Adams was appointed a committee with power to confer informally with the Assistant Secretary of State Phillips in the matter. In company with the chairman he met with Mr. Phillips at 2.15 in the afternoon.

14. LATIMER PAINTINGS: Early in November Senator Saulsbury of Delaware wrote a letter to Senator Lea, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, stating that certain citizens of Delaware wish to present to the United States two handsome portraits of James Latimer and Henry Latimer, prominent Delawareans during the Revolutionary Period. These two paintings were stated to be in the custody of a Miss Latimer, a descendant of the Latimers living near Wilmington, Delaware, and were painted in the early period of the country. Senator Lea notified Senator Saulsbury that the portraits should be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts before they are offered to the Committee on the Library for acceptance. Colonel Harts thereupon communicated with Senator Saulsbury for the purpose of getting in touch with the two paintings so that they could be inspected by the Commission. During the ensuing correspondence

it developed that Miss Latimer desired to have duplicates of the two portraits painted by a Delaware artist, named Clawson S. Hamitt; and Senator Saulsbury asked whether it would be convenient for the Commission to send some art critic to see the two original portraits in the custody of Miss Latimer and also portraits of these two men painted by Mr. Hamitt (presented to the State and now hanging in the state house at Dover) which would show his skill as an artist. Mr. Blashfield agreed to make this visit of inspection for the Commission, and was appointed a Committee with power for this purpose. Upon getting in touch with Senator Saulsbury over long distance telephone at Wilmington, Mr. Blashfield arranged for this inspection for Saturday afternoon. His report as well as the report to the Senator based thereon are attached hereto as Exhibits G. and H.

15. REPORT ON COMPETITIONS TO THE WAR DEPARTMENT: Mr. Olmsted, as Chairman of the Committee which was appointed to prepare a report to the War Department on a simple method of conducting competitions, etc. reported progress on behalf of his Committee.

It being time for luncheon this was again served in Colonel Harts' office, the members of the Commission present having as their guest the Director of the Mint, Mr. Woolley. His presence offered opportunity of discussing in some detail the coinage question that had arisen the previous day.

There being no further business to come up before the Commission they adjourned at 2 p.m., subject to the call of the Chairman.

COLONEL, U. S. ARMY

Approved: Charles Moore

December 14, 1915.

Mr. President:

The Commission of Fine Arts, in submitting the fifth annual report, feel that, as a matter of duty rather than as a matter of complaint, they should invite your attention to a number of instances where their advice has not been followed.

First, the advice of the Commission was overlooked in the matter of the erection of a building opposite Rawlins Square intended to be used among other purposes for the administrative offices of the Interior Department. The advice of the Commission in this matter is set forth in its report to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated September 1, 1914, a copy of which is inclosed.

Second, the Commission has consistently advised against the type of architecture for school buildings in the District of Columbia adopted for the new Central High School. In disregard of the Executive order dated November 28, 1913, the plans for this building were not submitted to the Commission; but in previous instances of school construction strong recommendation had been made against the attempt to introduce the Elizabethan style, and in favor of adhering to the traditions established in all the earlier public buildings of Washington and based on Colonial prototypes.

Third, the Commission was asked for advice in connection with the preparation of a design for the important new bridge being erected over Rock Creek at Pennsylvania Avenue. Its suggestion that the lines be made more refined and that some architect should be consulted in the modification of the design appears to have been disregarded.

The Commission does not know in every case the reasons why those in charge deem it expedient not to follow the advice of the Commission, but it is assumed

December 14, 1915.

Mr. President:

The Commission of Fine Arts, in submitting the fifth annual report, feel that, as a matter of duty rather than as a matter of complaint, they should invite your attention to a number of instances where their advice has not been followed.

First, the advice of the Commission was overlooked in the matter of the erection of a building opposite Potomac Square intended to be used among other purposes for the administrative offices of the Interior Department. The advice of the Commission in this matter is set forth in its report to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated September 1, 1914, a copy of which is inclosed.

Second, the Commission has consistently advised against the type of preparatory for school buildings in the District of Columbia adopted for the new Central High School. In disregard of the Executive order dated November 20, 1913, the plans for this building were not submitted to the Commission, but in previous instances of school construction strong recommendation had been made against the attempt to introduce the Elizabethan style, and in favor of adhering to the traditions established in all the earlier public buildings of Washington and based on Colonial prototypes.

Third, the Commission was asked for advice in connection with the preparation of a design for the important new bridge being erected over Rock Creek at Pennsylvania Avenue. The suggestion that can alone be made more refined and that some architect should be commissioned in the modification of the design appears to have been disregarded.

The Commission does not know in every case the reasons why steps in charge deem it expedient not to follow the advice of the Commission, but it is desired

The President

that in all such cases good reasons exist. For the information of the Commission, therefore, and to assist them in giving more useful advice in the future, would it not be desirable for the President to direct that a statement of reasons be given to the Commission in all cases where advice obtained from them is not to be followed?

Respectfully,

Charles Moore

Chairman.

The President,

The White House.

The President

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WASHINGTON

December 3, 1913.

Dear Mr. Moore:

I should be very glad to know, for my own information, whether the Commission of Fine Arts favors the site which has already been selected for the State Department, or whether in their opinion a better site would be that block bounded by Lafayette Square, Pennsylvania Avenue, Seventeenth Street, and H Street, known as square 167 of the Assessor's platt book.

As I understand that the Commission is now in session, I am taking the liberty of referring this inquiry to you at this time.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM PHILLIPS.

Charles Moore, Esq.,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

"B"

December 4, 1915.

Dear Mr. Phillips:

Your letter of December third was brought to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at the meeting yesterday. I was instructed to reply that the Commission does not favor the site selected for the State Department; but does favor as the site for that building the block bounded by Lafayette Square, Pennsylvania Avenue, Seventeenth and H streets, known as square 167 of the Assessor's plat book.

It is understood that Congress contemplated the location of three departmental buildingsin the area extending from Pennsylvania Avenue to B street, North, along Fifteenth street; that the demands for space for such buildings was so great as to force the State Department building into the Mall; but that as yet no sanction has been given to the use of any portion of the Mall for such purposes.

This Commission recognizes the desirability, if not the necessity, of locating the State Department near the White House as a matter of convenience in transacting public business. Moreover, the building as planned by the Department includes provisions for functions that make a central location highly desirable.

Attention is called to the fact that about fifteen years ago plans were drawn for a building for combined use of the State Department and the Department of Justice, to be located on the Lafayette Square site; but the State Department felt at the time that the demands of the Department required the use of the entire space. During the interval these demands have not decreased.

The Government already owns a considerable portion of the square in question and rents other portions. The buildings on the square are of an inexpensive character; and the construction of a public building on that site would work a very considerable change for the better in the appearance of the city and the surroundings of the White House.

In this connection it is to be noted that in Senate Report 166, Fifty-seventh Congress, the use of this site for the State Department is recommended.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore.
Chairman.

Hon. William Phillips,

The Department of State.

December 9, 1915.

My dear Mr. Woolley:

After your conferences with the Commission on Friday and Saturday last, Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield (the sculptor and the painter members respectively) were appointed a committee to assist you along the lines discussed with you.

Mr. Adams, as Chairman of his committee, has just sent me the enclosed informal letter for transmission to you. He informs me that he talked with each of the three sculptors mentioned in this letter, but had tried to give the impression that he had simply been asked by the Treasury Department to consult with them to ascertain if they would freely cooperate with the Mint on the practical side, if asked to make the designs.

The Commission would appreciate it if these sculptors were not informed that they had been suggested to you by the Commission.

Cordially, yours,

WM. W. HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. Robert W. Woolley,

Director of the Mint.

December 9, 1915.

My dear Mr. Woolley:

After your conferences with the Commission on Friday and Saturday last, Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield (the sculptor and the painter members respectively) were appointed a committee to meet you along the lines discussed with you.

Mr. Adams, as Chairman of his committee, has just sent me the enclosed informal letter for transmission to you. He informs me that he talked with each of the three sculptors mentioned in this letter, but had tried to give the impression that he had simply been asked by the Treasury Department to consult with them to ascertain if they would freely cooperate with the Mint on the practical side, if asked to make the designs.

The Commission would appreciate it if these sculptors were not informed that they had been suggested to you by the Commission.

Cordially, yours,

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. Robert W. Woolley,

Director of the Mint.

December 8, 1915.

Hon. R. W. Woolley,
Director of the Mint,
Treasury Department, Washington, D. C?

My dear Mr. Woolley:

After carefully considering the matter of securing designs for the new silver coins, I have informally talked the subject over with Messrs, Hermon A. MacNeil, Adolph Weinman, and Albin Polasek. I find that they all realize the great educational value of a beautiful coinage, and appreciate the honour bestowed upon an artist asked to design a coin which is to be seen by millions of people every day.

From what I know of these men, I felt that they would naturally attack the problem in a practical manner, and I found on talking with them that each of them agrees with me that the only logical way to approach such a problem would be to go to the Mint, study the methods of manufacture and learn the practical requirements, at the very start. I believe each of these men has the artistic ability to produce a design which will be a credit to the Administration, and that they would be practical in adapting their work to the requirements of modern coinage.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT ADAMS

Committee.

December 8, 1915.

Hon. R. W. Woolley,
Director of the Mint,
Treasury Department, Washington, D. C?

My dear Mr. Woolley:

After carefully considering the matter of securing designs for the new silver coins, I have informally talked the subject over with Dr. Percon A. MacNeil, Adolph Weinman, and Albin Polasek. I find that they all realize the great educational value of a beautiful coinage, and appreciate the honour bestowed upon an artist asked to design a coin which is to be seen by millions of people every day.

From what I know of these men, I felt that they would naturally attack the problem in a practical manner, and I found on talking with them that each of them agrees with me that the only logical way to approach such a problem would be to go to the Mint, study the methods of manufacture and learn the practical requirements, at the very start. I believe each of these men has the artistic ability to produce a design which will be a credit to the Administration, and that they would be practical in adapting their work to the requirements of modern coinage.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT ADAMS

Committee.

Washington, D. C.

December 13, 1915.

Sir:

In compliance with your letter of December 2, 1914, referring for report S.J.Res.156, 63d Congress, 2d Session, providing for the completion of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol, the Commission of Fine Arts have studied the problem from various angles and have considered a number of alternative suggestions for its solution. After consulting with the Superintendent of the Capitol and having the benefit of his knowledge of the situation, the Commission have the honor to report that, under present conditions, it is deemed inadvisable to attempt either alteration or continuation of the frieze as it now stands.

Work done by the Superintendent of the Capitol, Mr. Elliot Woods, in uncovering the stone surface has been of great value in adding to the beauty of the Rotunda. Should further work of the kind at any time suggest an opportunity for advantageous reconsideration of the problem, the Commission of Fine Arts would be glad again to answer to the best of their ability any questions that might be asked of them.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. Luke Lea,
Chairman, Committee on the
Library of the United States Senate.

A B C

Washington, D. C.

November 15, 1913.

Sir:

In compliance with your letter of December 2, 1912, referring for report S.J.Res.155, 62d Congress, 2d Session, providing for the completion of the Thirteenth Price in the Rotunda of the Capitol, the Commission of Fine Arts have studied the problem from various angles and have considered a number of alternative suggestions for its solution. After consulting with the Superintendent of the Capitol and having the benefit of his knowledge of the situation, the Commission have the honor to report that, under present conditions, it is deemed inadvisable to attempt either alteration or continuation of the frieze as it now stands.

Work done by the Superintendent of the Capitol, Mr. Elliot Woods, in uncovering the stone surface has been of great value in adding to the beauty of the Rotunda. Should further work of the kind at any time suggest an opportunity for advantageous reconsideration of the problem, the Commission of Fine Arts would be glad again to answer to the best of their ability any questions that might be asked of them.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

Col. C. Moore
Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. Lees Smith,
Chairman, Committee on the
Library of the United States Senate.

A B C

My dear Senator Lea:

On December 22, 1913, the Joint Committee on the Library adopted the following resolution:

"RESOLVED, That the Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds be requested to report to the Committee at its next meeting a plan for the termination of the use of the ground now occupied by the Botanic Garden, as such, with reference to the unveiling of the Grant Memorial erected on these grounds, but before making such report said officer should consult with the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the subject."

In response to this resolution the Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds recommended on February 9, 1914, that:

1. The iron fence and the brick and stone coping to be removed.

2. The fountain to be removed to a suitable position in the public grounds.

3. The greenhouses to be removed to such a place as may be agreed upon by the Committee, the areas now occupied by them to be turned over to the Chief of Engineers as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia.

4.

4. Estimates of the cost of this work and a statment of the time required for clearing the grounds above mentioned.

Since this report was made no action has been taken. Supplementing this partial report, and after a more detailed study of the questions involved, it is recommended in respect of

2. That the fountain in the Botanic Gardens be removed, and relocated in Lincoln Park. On examination the area in that park available for such fountain has been found sufficient. Moreover, the location there of a large fountain would enhance the value of the park to the large number of people who use it; and at the same time would supply an object of adornment and interest to a section not now adequately provided with such embellishments, in comparison with some other portions of the District.

3. The time has come for determination by Congress of the policy to be pursued in regard to the Botanic Gardens. It is assumed that Congress intends to provide for the continuation and development of the Gardens, either under its own authority as at present or under some other existing Government agency. Obviously the time to make such provision is when the Gardens shall be relocated. If the development of the Gardens is to be commensurate with that in similar gardens in other cities and countries not less than 50 acres will be necessary.

The areas occupied by various bot nic gardens are:

Areas in use.

St. Petersburg, Russia: The botanical gardens of St. Petersburg are located on an island in the Neva and embrace an area of about 34 acres.

E-1

On December 22, 1932, the Joint Committee on the Library adopted the following resolution:

"RESOLVED, That the Library be open on Public Holidays and Sundays be requested to report to the Committee at its next meeting a plan for the termination of the use of the crowd now occupied in the Botanic Garden, or such, with reference to the acquiring of the Grant Memorial erected on Union Square, not before reading such report said officer should consult with the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the subject."

In response to this resolution the Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds recommended on February 9, 1933, that:

1. The Law Court and the Folk and other matter to be removed.

2. The Capitol to be removed to a suitable position in the public grounds.

3. The Greenhouse to be moved to such a place as may be agreed upon by the Committee, the space now occupied by them to be turned over to the Color of Columbia as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia.

4.

5. Retention of the rest of this work and a statement of the time required for clearing the grounds above mentioned.

Since this report was made no action has been taken. Inasmuch this period

report, and after a more detailed study of the questions involved, it is recommended

a respect of

1. That the fountain in the Botanic Garden be removed, and relocated in Lincoln Park. On consideration the area in that park available for such fountain has been sufficient. However, the location there of a large fountain would enhance the value of the park to the large number of people who use it, and at the same time would supply an object of adornment and interest to a section not now adequately provided with such embellishments, in comparison with some other portions of the District.

3. The time has come for determination by Congress of the policy to be pursued in regard to the Botanic Garden. It is assumed that Congress intends to provide for the maintenance and development of the Garden, either under its own authority or by permit or some other existing Government agency. Obviously to this it the park portion is open the Botanic shall be relocated. If the development of the Garden is to be commensurate with that in similar gardens in this and countries, yet large sums of money will be necessary.

The areas occupied by various [illegible] are:

Area in use.

St. Petersburg, Russia: The botanical gardens of St. Petersburg are located on [illegible] in the Peter and Paul Fortress on the left bank of the Neva.

Paris, France: The Jardin des Plas contains about 50 acres. Its museum of natural history with its zoological yard its hot houses, greenhouses, nursery and naturalization gardens make it an institution of universally acknowledged eminence.

Edinburgh, Scotland: The Royal Botal Garden contains about 50 acres.

Glasgow, Scotland: The botanic gard contained here formerly 21½ acres, but this has been increased to 40 acres.

Buenos Aires, Argentina: The botani gardens of this city consist of about 23 acres and it is considered the show pl of the city.

Boston, Mass.: Arnold Arboretum cov now 222 acres and practically forms a part of the park system of Boston.

London, England: The Kew Gardens pro contain an area of about 253 acres, of which 75 are botanical gardens and 178 arbtum.

Berlin, Germany: The botanic garden e comprises 1325 acres, is located near Dahlen, and is about ten minutes ride by r from the city, and cost the Imperial Treasury about $4,000,000.

Shaw Botanic Garden in St. Louis, occus about 80 acres, and is among the best equipped in the world.

Various sites in the District of Colum offer opportunities and special advantages. No one of these available sites has ch a superiority over the others as to make it conspicuously the best. Nor can it determined which choice would commend itself to Congress. Therefore it is suggested that the Joint Committee on the Library, under whose jurisdiction the Botanic Garden maintained, investigate the subject of such relocation. It is further suggested that the Superintendent of the Botanic Gardens, the Officer in Charge of Buildings & Grounds, with the addition of such experts as the Committee may name, be authorized to study the subject and report to the Committee their findings.

Very truly yours,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army.
In Charge.

Hon. Luke Lea,
Chairman, Joint Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Berlin, Germany: The Jardin des Plantes contains about 50 acres. Its museum of natural history with its zoological gardens for [illegible], preservation, research and scientific purposes makes it an institute of universally acknowledged eminence.

Hamburg, Germany: The Royal Botan. Garden contains about 50 acres.

Vienna, Austria: The Botanic Garden contains some 50 acres, but [illegible] has been increased to 60 acres.

Buenos Aires, Argentina: The botanic gardens of this city consist of about [illegible] acres and it is considered the show place the city.

Boston, Mass.: Arnold Arboretum covers 222 acres and practically forms a part of the park system of Boston.

Dublin, England: The Kew Gardens [illegible] an area of about 144 acres, of which 11 are botanical gardens and its arboretum.

Berlin, Germany: The Botanic Garden [illegible] 100 acres, is located [illegible], and is about ten minutes ride by tram car city. And next the Botanical [illegible] treasury about $4,000,000.

There Botanic Garden in St. Louis, [illegible] about 70 acres, [illegible] the best equipped in the world.

Various other in the District of Columbia [illegible] Botanic [illegible] Agriculture. No one of these available sites has a superiority over the others as to [illegible] be economically the best. The act, it appears [illegible] necessary to submit to Congress. Therefore it is suggested the Joint Committee on the Library, [illegible] Botanic Garden Industrial, [illegible] the Library Committee as the Committee may name, be authorize to study the subject and report to the Committee their findings.

Very truly yours,

[illegible]
Brig. Gen., U. S. Army.
In Charge.

Chairman, Joint Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

December 4, 1915.

Dear Sirs:

In reviewing the design for the fish market to be located on the water front between Eleventh and Twelfth streets, S.W., transmitted for consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts with your letter of yesterday, the Commission recognize that in virtue of the location along the waterway, and facing the proposed recreation park in East Potomac Park, this building group will be a conspicuous feature in the outward aspect of Washington, and that the character of the design, therefore, assumes great importance.

The purpose of the building, allowing for large wall surfaces, gives the designer the utmost freedom in the handling of the various elements of the composition. The Commission feel that Flemish gable treatment strikes a discordant note, and they therefore disapprove of the design as submitted.

In accordance with ~~its~~ their previous recommendations in favor of a uniform policy in the choice of a style for public buildings, the Commission of Fine Arts have the honor to recommend the preparation of a design in sympathy with the Classic or derived Colonial motives which characterize the best of the older public buildings.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia,

Washington, D. C.

ABC

Dec. 6, 1915. 242

My dear Colonel Harts:

My reasons for favoring the selection of Mr. Hamitt as painter of the copies of the Latimer portraits are as follows: James Latimer was very closely connected with the adoption of the Constitution. He financed and led the Delaware troops and equipped ships. His son Dr. Henry Latimer, Surgeon-General 1777, had (I am told) a price of five hundred pounds set on his head by the enemy. In the case of such famous men the essential is to have a likeness, a document, in either case rather than a work of art. The Work of Mr. Hamitt, to judge from the copy which I saw in the Dover Capitol, is uninteresting, but careful and painstaking. He is in my opinion quite as likely to be faithful to the original as would be an artist more skillful in brush work and therefore possibly more insistent on his own personal technique.

Miss Latimer who is an old lady and a cripple seems very eager to do just what the Commission may wish. She is the last of her family (save for distant relatives). She seems very sensible of "The honor of having the copies accepted." It has occurred to me that she might be not averse to willing these originals to the Nation after her death.

Perhaps Senator Saulsbury, who, I understand, is a warm friend of Miss Latimer, might tell us something or advise us. Should there be a possibility of getting these originals eventually I should advocate it as our policy. In the meantime, we could accept the copies. In regard to the originals as works of art, I will say - The portrait of Dr. Henry Latimer is a chalk profile a little larger than life, by Saint Memin and is distinctly interesting and characteristic of the epoch of its executors. In the portrait (in oil) of James Latimer, the hands are feeble but the head is very closely and carefully studied as a likeness and is full of character. The portrait of his wife evidently by the same artist is again interesting as to the head. The copy by Harriett is not literally a copy in the case of Henry Latimer, but a rendering in oil colours from the original.

I hesitated for a moment as to whether we should ask Hamitt to attempt more of a facsimile of the original. For our present purpose I think a duplicate of his oil copy in the Dover Capitol would suit our purpose as it is in scale with our other portraits. (The Saint Memin is larger in scale.)

I return to the wish that we might obtain original portraits for the government whenever we can. Surely the sooner we have a nucleus for a National Portrait Gallery (after the example of London) the better.

I think Miss Latimer would cling to her heirlooms during her life but her attitude was very sympathetic. They talked of nothing but Revolutionary War and the first fifteen years of the Nineteenth Century. While we were in the motor they showed me the spot near the Brandywine where "The Stars and Stripes were unfurled for the first time under fire". Pardon this long letter, in a way it seemed necessary to explain.

Sincerely yours,

Edwin H. Blashfield.

They could not tell me who painted the original of Jas. Latimer. I think Miss Latimer might be willing to send Mr. Hamitt to Washington or New York to talk with me about his treatment of the portraits, the copies.

"G"

Dec. 6, 1915.

242

Dear Colonel Harts:

My reasons for favoring the selection of Mr. Hamitt as painter of the copies of
e Latimer portraits are as follows: James Latimer was very closely connected with the
loption of the Constitution. He financed and led the Delaware troops and equipped
ip. His son Dr. Henry Latimer, Surgeon-General 1777, had (I am told) a price of
ve hundred pounds set on his head by the enemy. In the case of such famous men the
sential is to have a likeness, a document, in either case rather than a work of art.
e Work of Mr. Hamitt, to judge from the copy which I saw in the Dover Capitol,
interesting, but careful and painstaking. He is in my opinion quite as likely
be faithful to the original as would be an artist more skillful in brush work and
herefore possibly more insistent on his own personal technique.

Miss Latimer who is an old lady and a cripple seems very eager to do just what
e Commission may wish. She is the last of her family (save for distant relatives).
e seems very sensible of "The honor of having the copies accepted." It has occurred
me that she might be not averse to willing these originals to the Nation after her
ath.

Perhaps Senator Saulsbury, who, I understand, is a warm friend of Miss Latimer,
ght tell us something or advise us. Should there be a possibility of getting these
riginals eventually I should advocate it as our policy. In the meantime, we could
cept the copies. In regard to the originals as works of art, I will say - The portrait
Dr. Henry Latimer is a chalk profile a little larger than life, by Saint Memin and
distinctly interesting and characteristic of the epoch of its executors. In the
ortrait (in oil) of James Latimer, the hands are feeble but the head is very
osely and carefully studied as a likeness and is full of character. The portrait
his wife evidently by the same artist is again interesting as to the head. The
opy by Harriett is not literally a copy in the case of Henry Latimer, but a rendering
oil colours from the original.

I hesitated for a moment as to whether we should ask Hamitt to attempt more or
facsimile of the original. For our present purpose I think a duplicate of his oil
opy in the Dover Capitol would suit our purpose as it is in scale with our other
ortraits. (The Saint Memin is larger in scale.)

I return to the wish that we might obtain original portraits for the government
henever we can. Surely the sooner we have a museum for a National Portrait Gallery
(after the example of London) the better.

I think Miss Latimer would cling to her heirlooms during her life but her attitude
as very sympathetic. They talked of nothing but Revolutionary War and the first
fifteen years of the Nineteenth Century. While we were in the motor they showed me
the spot near the Brandywine where "The Stars and Stripes were unfurled for the
first time under fire". Pardon this long letter, in a way it seemed necessary to
explain.

Sincerely yours,

Edwin H. Blashfield.

They would not tell me who painted the original of Jas. Latimer. I think Miss
Latimer might be willing to send Mr. Hamitt to Washington or New York to talk
with me about his treatment of the portraits, the copies.

1916

E MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
LD ON JANUARY 26, 1916.

244

243

Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1916,

29 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., on Wednesday,

My dear Senator Saulsbury: members were present:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on December third, I brought to their attention your letter of November thirtieth and previous correspondence regarding the Latimer paintings. The Commission were anxious to be of all possible assistance to you in this matter, and Mr. Edwin H. Blashfield, the eminent painter of New York and the painter member of the Commission, agreed to act as their committee and make a personal examination of the paintings referred to at Dover.

Colonel W. W. Harts, United States Army, the Secretary and

Since you are aware of the details leading up to his examination I need not touch upon them. Mr. Blashfield prepared his report which has just been received, and I proceed at once to the business you with his suggestions and recommendations than to quote it to you. Mr. Blashfield says:

order at 2 p.m. and

than

"I beg to report as follows: The committee appointed to examine and report on the question of the Latimer portraits offered to the Government, and officially before the Commission and directed by reference of the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library.

I visited the house of Miss Mary Latimer, and took [illegible] Colonel originals of the two portraits, copies of which she proposed to donate.

I then went to Dover to confer with the Capitol architects and examine Mr. Hammitt, the artist whom Miss Latimer would like to select as executant of the copies. I was accompanied by Messrs. McGeary, new central friends of Senator Saulsbury. They accompanied me throughout the afternoon and evening and extended to me every courtesy. On the way to Dover (our motor car broke down midway, and we had to go to a station and take a slow train) we reached Wilmington at the foot of the Delaware Bay, where who were to meet us. We visited the Statehouse alone and were able to locate only one of the copies, the other having presumably been diverted of the locked rooms.

I consider the date sufficiently recent that the Commission of Fine Arts shall favor Miss Latimer's wish for the selection of Mr. Hammitt as painter of the copies, and I recommend that the Commission immediately

If there is any further assistance the Commission can render you in this or any other matter, I am sure you will not hesitate to call.

Most sincerely, yours,

Wm. W. Harts.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. Willard Saulsbury,
United States Senate.

H